

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application Serial No. .... 10/809,172  
Confirmation No. .... 6811  
Filing Date ..... 3/25/2004  
Inventorship ..... Timothy S. Paek  
Appellant..... Microsoft Corporation  
Group Art Unit..... 2167  
Examiner ..... Kimberly M. Lovel  
Attorney's Docket No. .... MS1-3990US  
Title: Wave Lens Systems and Methods for Search Results

**REPLY BRIEF**

To: Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Dale G. Mohlenhoff (Tel. 509-944-4738; Fax 509-323-8979)  
**Customer No. 22801**

Dear Sir:

Appellant's representative submits this Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.41 in response to Examiner's Answer dated May 1, 2009, in connection with Appellant's Appeal Brief filed March 25, 2009. Appellant respectfully requests favorable consideration. In accordance with the instructions on page 28 of the Examiner's Answer, Appellant elects option 2 to maintain the appeal by filing this Reply Brief.

### **Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

- A. Whether claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over "Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization" to Roberts *et al.* (hereafter "Roberts") in 4 10/809,172 MS307451.011MSFTP607US view of the article "Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces" to Pook *et al.* (hereafter "Pook").
- B. Whether claim 13 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Roberts in view of Pook and further in view of Wolton *et al.* (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741; hereafter "Wolton").
- C. Whether claim 14 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488I; hereafter "Montague").
- D. Whether claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US Pub. No. 2007/0156677; hereafter "Szabo").

### **Response to Arguments**

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance made in Appellant's previously-filed Appeal Brief. No admission or comment is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not

addressed herein. Appellant further argues as follows in view of the Examiner's Answer.

**A. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner cited Section 3, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph and Section 4, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Roberts as allegedly teaching this limitation. The 5th paragraph of Section 3 states:

"A sliding window methodology is also applied to the design, such that the user **may directly slide the focus view up and down to change the information that is displayed in the center (and corresponding bracketed) views**. This acts in a similar way to a fish-eye view where the center window displays the full resolution and a lower level of detail is shown either side." (Emphasis added)

The 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 4.1 states:

"Figure 4 shows a screen shot of this realization. After the user types and submits a query to the Google web service a set of results are visualized according to our bracketing concept. One result is shown in full detail (focus view), **the next n (in this case 5) are displayed either side as URL's** and the remaining results are displayed as greeked lines. The user can scroll up and down to alter the focus information, or merely click on any result (Greeked or URL) and **the result will become the new focus view**; the rest of the visualization rearranges itself accordingly."

The 2nd paragraph of Section 2.1 of Roberts states:

"One SRE contains nine variables concerning one URL that matches the keyword search. In this work we focus on four main variables (title, URL, paragraph of text and page size). We use a model-view-

controller design-pattern in our implementation, and thus store each of the SRE's in a list that can be visualized on demand."

In the Office Action, the Examiner makes several interpretations as follows: "the Examiner interprets the information inside the focus view as representing the detailed subset of information. Before the sliding window is placed on the SRE, it is represented by an URL or a greeked line and afterwards it is represented as an SRE contain full information. The full detail contains additional information such as title, paragraph of text, page size, etc. The Examiner interprets the additional information such as the paragraph of text as being analogous to the claimed "additional textual information." The additional information (title, paragraph of text, page size, etc.) is dependent on the SRE that is located in the sliding window. Therefore, Roberts is considered to meet the claimed phrase "that is selected from the at least one search result." This additional information is now present in the focus view which as mentioned previously is considered to represent the detailed subset of information. The last portion of the limitation states "based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result." Since the user enters a query into Google's API, the results are considered to be dependent upon the query. (Examiner's Answer, page 18.)

Appellant respectfully disagrees and respectfully submits that Examiner's interpretation as set forth above is not correct. Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

a layout component that displays a **detailed subset of information**, comprising textual information, **within the area defined by the lens component** based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size **and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information** based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component. (Emphasis added.)

Appellant respectfully submits that Roberts first teaches a “sliding window methodology” in the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of Section 3 in which the focus view changes and “any additional information” is located in a new focus view window. Roberts does not teach or suggest “the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Roberts further teaches in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Section 4.1 that “a set of results are visualized according to our bracketing concept. One result is shown in full detail (focus view), the next n (in this case 5) are displayed either side as URL’s and the remaining results are displayed as greeked lines.” Again, Roberts does not teach or suggest that “the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information.”

Roberts further teaches in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of Section 2.1 that “[o]ne SRE contains nine variables concerning one URL that matches the keyword search...We use a model-view-controller design-pattern in our implementation,

and thus **store each of the SRE's in a list that can be visualized on demand.**" (Emphasis added.) Again, it is respectfully submitted that the additional information is not located in the focus view. Therefore, Roberts does not teach or suggest "the detailed subset of information...include[s] additional textual information." For at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that the pending rejection be overturned. In addition, Appellant respectfully requests that the pending rejections for independent claims 20, 21 and 25 be overturned for at least similar reasons as those for independent claim 1.

**B. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 13 is rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Roberts, in view of Pook and in further view of Wolton. Wolton fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts and Pook with respect to independent claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1 and the previous arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief, the combination of Roberts, Pook and Wolton, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter since claim 13 depends from independent claim 1.

**C. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 14 is rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Roberts, in view of Pook and in further view of Montague. Montague fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts and Pook with respect to independent claim 1. For the reasons stated

above in regards to claim 1 and the arguments previously set forth in the Appeal Brief, the combination of Roberts, Pook and Montague, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter since claim 14 depends from independent claim 1.

**D. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 18 is rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Roberts, in view of Pook and in further view of Szabo. Szabo fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts and Pook with respect to independent claim 1. For the reasons stated above in regards to claim 1 and the arguments previously set forth in the Appeal Brief, the combination of Roberts, Pook and Szabo, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter since claim 18 depends from independent claim 1.

**Conclusion**

For at least the reasons provided above, Appellant respectfully submits that the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action of February 15, 2008 in connection with the subject application should be reversed. Appellant respectfully requests favorable consideration of this Reply Brief.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2009

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/

Dale G. Mohlenhoff  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 37,683  
(509) 944-4738

David S. Lee  
Reg. No. 38,222  
(206) 315-7912